

Schleiermacher and Bonhoeffer as negative theologians: a Western response to some Eastern challenges

Alexander S Jensen

When I was at university, a Greek Orthodox friend used to tell me about the many errors of the West and about the way in which the Easterners got it right. 'You in the West, you got it all wrong because Augustine did not speak Greek,' he used to say. According to him, the root of our Western errors is a

Dr Alexander Jensen is Senior Lecturer in Systematic Theology at Murdoch University, Perth, and Principal of Perth Theological Hall.

wrong doctrine of the Trinity, which we developed because Augustine did not understand the difference between *ousia* and *hypostasis*.¹ A second reason why our Western theology went so badly astray, I was informed, was that we do not understand apophaticism properly. In the East, they know how to distinguish between apophatic or negative theology on the one hand and kataphatic or positive theology on the other, while we in the West muddled it all up when Thomas Aquinas suggested a middle way between them in the form of analogical language in relation to God.

It is this second point on which I concentrate in this paper. I do this not only because my Greek friend kept making this point, but also because this comment about Western theology is widespread in Eastern Orthodox literature. We can see this expressed, for example, in the work of Vladimir Lossky and Christos Yannaras.²

In this paper, I present two different Eastern Orthodox understandings of apophaticism, as represented by the theologies of Vladimir Lossky and Christos Yannaras. I then suggest that the Western theological tradition has at least one strand within it that uses apophatic theology in the way in which Yannaras suggests it should be used. In particular, I identify Friedrich Schleiermacher and Dietrich Bonhoeffer as negative theologians and discuss their understanding of how we gain and communicate knowledge of God. I discuss briefly the role of the Holy Spirit in theology and make some concluding remarks. This may serve as a good introduction to a body of papers on the doctrine of God.

Apophaticism

Apophatic or negative theology has been part of both Eastern and Western theological tradition since the inception of Christianity. In the Western tradition, it has been seen as a counterweight to the positive statements about God. We can see this balance in the work of Thomas Aquinas. For Thomas, the *via negativa* supplements the *via affirmationis*. On the one hand, we cannot know the divine essence, and thus cannot use terms that refer to creation in relation to God univocally. However, Thomas synthesises negative and positive theology when he suggests that we can, indeed, speak of God in affirmations, although they must be understood analogically.³ Because there is a structural analogy between the being of God and the being of creatures, we can use human language in order to speak about God, as long as we recognise the limitation of human concepts as defined by the

Fourth Lateran Council: 'because between the Creator and the creature so great a likeness cannot be noted without the necessity of noting a greater dissimilarity between them.'⁴

Within the Eastern Orthodox tradition, there are two approaches to apophaticism.⁵ One of them uses apophaticism as a way of gaining knowledge of God. The gradual stripping off of all creaturely concepts and ideas of God leads, in the end, to a pure and immediate knowledge of the ineffable God. We can see this traditional view expressed in the writings of Vladimir Lossky. Lossky defines apophatic theology:

The negative way of the knowledge of God is an ascendant undertaking of the mind that progressively eliminates all positive attributes of the object it wishes to attain, in order to culminate finally in a kind of apprehension by supreme ignorance of Him who cannot be an object of knowledge.⁶

In order to pursue a theology of the *via negativa*, Lossky suggests, a gradual stripping away of attributes from the concept of God will lead the theologian to 'attain' the transcendent Trinity, to be directed 'even beyond unknowing' and to be united with the triune Divinity.⁷ Consequently, apophasis is more than a mode of theological language. It is a theological method that leads to *theognosis* and union with God.

Christos Yannaras suggests a different understanding of apophaticism. Based on his reading of Pseudo-Dionysius, Yannaras proposes an apophaticism of person. Not the divine substance is known through apophatic theology, but the divine persons. Persons, whether human or divine, cannot be known objectively, because every person is a unique reality.⁸ Another person can be known well, and through ongoing interaction one can get to know someone else very well indeed, but one will never gain exhaustive knowledge. When describing someone, this description will never fully express who this person is; it will merely aid someone else to recognise the other person. It may also function to reject inappropriate descriptions and fulfil numerous other functions. However, it will never replace the personal encounter with the other person. The reason for this is that another person is known through relation, which respects the otherness of the other.⁹

Applied to God, this means that we cannot know what God is, that is, God's essence. However, knowledge of God is possible with regard to God's modes of existence, that is, his hypostases.¹⁰ This knowledge is based

on relationship with God, which, in turn, is identified by participation in the divine energies.¹¹ This participation in God and thus in the new life is primarily experienced in the liturgy.¹² Theological knowledge of God is thus grounded in the liturgically mediated experience of participation in God and in the new creation.

Theological language, according to Yannaras, describes God, praises God, excludes wrong descriptions of God which are not consonant with the Christian communal experience of God and so forth. However, theological language can never replace knowledge of God. Yannaras illustrates this with an imaginative analogy:

Let us suppose that someone appears who claims that *maternal love* means relentless strictness and wild daily beating of a child. All of us who have a different experience of maternal love will protest about this distortion and will oppose to it a *definition* of our own experience: For us maternal love is affection, tenderness, care, all combined with a judicious and constructive strictness.

Up to the moment when this falsification of the truth of maternal love appeared, there had existed no need to define our experience. Maternal love was something self-evident to us all, an experiential knowledge objectively indeterminate but also commonly understood. The need for a limit or definition is connected with the threat that maternal love may begin to be considered something other than what we all believe it to be.

But the definition simply signifies or marks off the limits of our experience, it cannot replace it. A man who has never in his life known maternal love [...] can know the definition but cannot know maternal love itself. In other words, knowledge of formulas and definitions of truth is not to be identified with the knowledge of truth itself. Therefore even an atheist can have learned to know well that the God of the Church is triadic, that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, but this does not mean that he knows these truths.¹³

Consequently, if theological language is understood as apophatic language, it communicates the Christian faith in various modes of language such as dogmatic language, narrative, praise and promise.¹⁴ However it does not communicate facts, but points at the experience of union with God and even may mediate it.

As I mentioned in the beginning, both Lossky and Yannaras claim that Western theology does not have an adequate notion of apophaticism. However, the Western theological tradition has developed a strong apophatic strand within itself, although naming it differently. This is the Romanticist, Existentialist and Hermeneutic tradition of theology, exemplified by Schleiermacher, Bultmann, Bonhoeffer, Ebeling, Macquarrie and many others. These authors ground Christian theology in experience, and use theological language in a way that is consonant with Yannaras' understanding of apophatic language. It is to this theological tradition that I turn my attention now.

Apophaticism in the West: Schleiermacher and Bonhoeffer

I have chosen Schleiermacher and Bonhoeffer for my discussion of apophatic theology in the West because this tradition began with Schleiermacher, while Bonhoeffer provides a particularly clear apophatic approach in his 'Lectures on Christology' of 1933. Besides, although Bonhoeffer is deeply indebted to Schleiermacher, he presents a perceptive critical discussion of Schleiermacher's approach in these lectures, on which I shall base my own critical observations. In my opinion, Bonhoeffer overcomes the shortcomings of Schleiermacher's theology. However, his own shortcoming is his neglect of the role of the Holy Spirit in gaining knowledge of God. This, I argue, needs to be addressed.

Schleiermacher

When I describe Schleiermacher's starting point as 'experiential', this needs to be taken with a grain of salt. 'Feeling', which is the foundation of Schleiermacher's religious epistemology, is not a discernable temporal experience, such as Wesley's 'strange warm feeling'. Instead, as Schleiermacher explains in the speeches *On Religion*, it is a change in the inner consciousness, a new relationship to one's mind and one's condition.¹⁵ Later, in *The Christian Faith*, Schleiermacher describes feeling as 'immediate self-consciousness'.¹⁶ However, in a loose sense we can call this 'experiential', because the immediate

feeling of absolute dependence or, in the earlier works, the intuition and feeling are immediate and thus pre-conceptual inner movements which can be treated analogously to experiences.

All religious language is, for Schleiermacher, an expression of the religious self-consciousness and must be related to it:

No matter can be thus introduced except in so far as it has a demonstrable and definite connexion with the religious affections which are found within the antithesis. Now since all Christian piety rests upon the appearing of the Redeemer, the same thing is true of Him too, namely, that nothing concerning Him can be set up as real doctrine unless it is connected with His redeeming causality and can be traced to the original impression made by His existence.¹⁷

Thus the content of theology is the expression of an ultimately ineffable pre-conscious human experience, that is the immediate feeling of absolute dependence. Within Christian religion, this feeling is expressed in the antithesis between sin and grace.¹⁸ This antithesis presupposes and contains another aspect, which is the religious self-consciousness in relation to the finite being of the world and the infinite being of God.¹⁹ Based on these fundamental assumptions, the religious self-consciousness is expressed in three forms, namely 'as descriptions of human states, or as conceptions of divine attributes and modes or action, or as utterances regarding the constitution of the world.'²⁰ Schleiermacher uses this as the organising principle of his dogmatics, *The Christian Faith*.

So we can identify the first apophatic element in Schleiermacher's theology: it is an expression of the ineffable experience of God's work within the human person. And indeed, when Schleiermacher explains the content of this work, he often speaks of the union of the believer with Christ.²¹ So the union with God, as an immediate feeling, is expressed indirectly by Christian theology. This correlates closely to Yannaras' apophaticism.

A second apophatic element can be found in the defining nature of theological language. We recall that Yannaras suggested that theological language needs to define, that is, to delimit the use of a concept where it is inappropriately described. Schleiermacher describes the task of dogmatics in very similar terms:

both to clear up the misconceptions which ever and again tend to arise in the whole business of making communications from the immediate religious life of the Christian, and also, so far as in it lies, to prevent such misconception.²²

So already in this short discussion of Schleiermacher we find important parallels between his theology and the apophatic tradition. Theological language refers indirectly to the ineffable work of God in the believer, and it guards theology against misconceptions of this work of God.

Before we can move on with our discussion though, we need to recognise some weaknesses in Schleiermacher's approach. Bonhoeffer identifies these in his 'Christology' lectures. First, he finds that Schleiermacher misinterprets the presence of Christ in the Church as a power in history, not as a person.²³ Bonhoeffer, as we see in the next section of this paper, lays great emphasis of the real and personal presence of Christ in the Church. Schleiermacher, Bonhoeffer argues, plays down the presence of Christ by interpreting it as 'the influence that emanates from him.'²⁴ Thus Christ is not present himself, but his energy is continuing his influence in history. In other words, the presence of Christ is nothing more than the attempt 'to reach across history to keep bringing the image of Christ into view.'²⁵

Second, Bonhoeffer criticises Schleiermacher for playing down the resurrection by interpreting it symbolically.²⁶ He puts this trenchantly: 'Ritschl and Hermann put the resurrection to one side; Schleiermacher symbolizes it; in doing so, they destroy the Church.'²⁷ Bonhoeffer contrasts this with Paul's emphatic statement, 'If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins' (1 Corinthians 15: 17). If Christ had not risen from the dead, he could not be present in the Church, and all theology would be in vain.

So if the presence of Christ is a mere extension of his influence, then there is no need to assume the resurrection in any more than a symbolic way. Against this assumption, Bonhoeffer seeks to safeguard what he sees as the foundation of all Christian theology, which is the experience of the personal presence of Christ in the Church. In his eyes, Schleiermacher's theology cannot express this adequately.

Bonhoeffer

When Bonhoeffer develops his own approach, he builds his Christology on a consistently experiential foundation. But, unlike Schleiermacher, he sees theology as the response to the encounter with the risen Christ in the Church:

[...] the place where our work must begin is clearly indicated. In the church, where Christ has revealed himself as the Word of God, the human *logos* asks the question: Who are you, Jesus Christ? *Logos* of God! The answer is given. The church receives it every day anew.²⁸

Bonhoeffer now needs to explain how we can understand the presence of Christ in the Church. As a good Lutheran, he is certainly suspicious of mystical experiences. So he locates the presence of Christ 'in the threefold form of Word, sacrament, and church-community'.²⁹ Resulting from this, the guiding question of theology must be 'by virtue of what personal ontological structure is Christ present to the church?'³⁰ One answer could be that this is 'by virtue of his God-humanity'. But this is not enough. The proper answer is 'the "*pro-me*" [Latin: "for me"] structure. The being of Christ's person is essentially relatedness to me. His being-Christ is his being-for-me'.³¹ This does not mean, according to Bonhoeffer, that Christ exists and that the *pro-me* is accidental. On the contrary, the *pro-me* is the very being of Christ's person. Consequently, theology can take place only 'in existential relationship to him and, at the same time, only within the church-community'.³²

Thus the experience of the presence of Christ is defined by its mediation through Word and sacrament as well as through the Church community. At the same time, the Christ who is present in the Church is the same as the historical figure of Jesus of Nazareth.³³ It is he, who was crucified and rose from the dead, who is now present in the Church.³⁴ Hence Bonhoeffer is not speaking of a general experience of a generic divine presence, but of the personal presence of Jesus Christ, who is the same as the man Jesus of Nazareth, and whose presence is a saving presence.

Consequently, theology is based on a personal encounter, the encounter of the Christian community and its individual members with the risen Christ. This encounter elicits a human response, which is the question 'Who are you?' This is an expression of the relational nature of theology – theology can only take place in relation and response to Jesus Christ, who can never

be an object of theological speculation.³⁵ Bonhoeffer proceeds to develop his Christology as an unfolding of the fundamental question: 'Who are you?'

So we can identify the first apophatic element in Bonhoeffer's theology: the structure of Bonhoeffer's Christological inquiry is similar to the apophaticism of person as described by Yannaras; both are based on the mystery of the encounter with the other, who, as a person, cannot be fully understood and explained, yet is known through relationship, and known better and better, yet without ever exhausting the mystery of the other person.

Theology that comes out of this experience cannot be understood in objectifying and conceptual terms. Instead, Bonhoeffer suggests that Christology – for which we can read theology here – needs to be critical or negative.³⁶ Negative theology is an expression of the incomprehensibility of the presence of Christ – or, in other words, that it is ineffable. Bonhoeffer puts this paradoxically: 'This is the part of Christology that seeks to make the incomprehensibility of the person of Jesus Christ comprehensible.'³⁷ Thus negative theology has a critical function insofar as it sets limits for what theology can say about the person of Jesus Christ.³⁸ Although Bonhoeffer does not say this explicitly, these limits should be understood to be set against inadequate expressions of the Christian experience of the presence of Christ in the Church. All positive Christology, and therefore all positive theology, must be built on the foundation of critical, negative theology.³⁹

Although Bonhoeffer does not say this explicitly, negative theology will prevent theologians from formulating a positive theology which makes statements about God that are not an expression of the corporate experience of the presence of the risen Christ in the Church. So we can identify the second element of apophaticism in Bonhoeffer's thought: theology is negative in so far as it defines, that is, sets boundaries for the legitimate expression of the foundational experience.

The Role of the Holy Spirit

The strength of Bonhoeffer's approach is that it avoids the vagueness that is the risk into which many other experience-based approaches run. For example, Rudolf Otto in his *The Idea of the Holy* begins with a universal phenomenology of the encounter with the holy, and only in a final step interprets the highest manifestation of this experience in a Christian way.⁴⁰ This is, in my opinion, a necessary consequence if the experience of the divine

is not mediated in any specific way, such as through Word and sacrament, but is left unspecified and free-floating.

However, I need to point out that there is also a significant difficulty in Bonhoeffer's approach, which is his neglect of the Holy Spirit. In the 'Christology' lectures, there is only one passage where Bonhoeffer discusses the work of the Holy Spirit. In it, he seems to collapse the work of the Holy Spirit into that of the Word:

That Christ is the Word means that he is the truth. Truth is only in the Word and through the Word. Spirit is, to begin with, Word and not power, action, or feeling. 'In the beginning was the Word All things came into being through him.' Only as Word is the Spirit power and action. 'The word of God is ... sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing until it divides'; it destroys. The Word of God carries within it the lightning that destroys and the rain that makes alive.⁴¹

In Lutheran theology, the Spirit works through Word and sacrament, thus is always mediated. However, in this passage Bonhoeffer goes further and subsumes the action of the Spirit completely under that of the Word. This neglect of the Holy Spirit, which leaves a much diminished role of the Spirit even in comparison with *Sanctorum Communio*,⁴² impoverishes Bonhoeffer's approach significantly. However, we must acknowledge that Bonhoeffer wrote before the rediscovery of the Holy Spirit in mainstream theology in the second half of the twentieth century, which manifested itself in the writings of Paul Tillich, John V Taylor, Jürgen Moltmann, Wolfhart Pannenberg and many others.⁴³ He also wrote before the liturgical reform movement re-evaluated the role of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist, which found its expression in a renewed emphasis on the epiclesis in the Eucharistic Prayer.

I cannot discuss the renewal of pneumatology in the twentieth century in any detail here. Instead I present a few short observations using the liturgical emphasis on the Holy Spirit in contemporary liturgies as a starting point. For example, the epiclesis of a contemporary Anglican Eucharistic prayer invokes the Holy Spirit in this way:

Lord, you are holy indeed, the source of all holiness; grant that by the power of your Holy Spirit, and according to your holy will, these gifts of bread and wine may be to us

the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ [...] Send the Holy Spirit on your people and gather into one in your kingdom all who share this one bread and one cup, so that we, in the company of all the saints, may praise and glorify you for ever, through Jesus Christ our Lord [...]⁴⁴

Here we can observe a strong emphasis on the activity of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit mediates the presence of Christ in the sacrament, gathers and sanctifies the community, and thus constitutes the Church. Thus the activity of the Holy Spirit comes logically before the presence and knowledge of Christ.

This is consonant with the patristic attitude that the Spirit reveals Christ, and that Christ reveals the Father, as it is expressed in the writings of St Basil of Caesarea:

He [the Spirit] reveals the glory of the Only-Begotten Himself, and He gives true worshippers the knowledge of God in Himself. The way to divine knowledge ascends from one Spirit through the one Son to the one Father.⁴⁵

We saw that the weakness of Bonhoeffer's approach is that he does not account for the Spirit's work of revealing the Son, mediating his presence and bringing about the Church, but collapses the work of the Spirit into the Word. A more balanced and therefore more consistently trinitarian theology must therefore have a pneumatological starting point; it must begin with the Spirit. We have seen this expressed in the Eucharistic Prayer. The revelation of the Son is the work of the Holy Spirit, the presence of Christ in the Church is mediated by the Spirit, the Church is gathered and constituted by the Spirit, and the Spirit enables the Church to respond in faith to the present Christ. Thus religious epistemology must be pneumatologically centred.

This means that all knowledge of God begins with the Spirit revealing the Son, who, in turn, reveals the Father. This is a personal encounter, a communal experience.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we can respond to our Orthodox friends that there is a strong apophatic tradition in Western theology, even if we call it differently.

More significantly though, this discussion has opened, at least for me, new perspectives on theological knowledge. Knowledge of the ineffable and

transcendent God is only possible in the encounter with Jesus Christ, mediated through the Holy Spirit – not as a pietistic, individual heart-warming feeling, but as the collective experience of the Eucharistic community. Theology's task is to interpret the encounter, and to draw conclusions from this about the nature of God and of humankind. Theology, in Oswald Bayer's words, 'begins and ends with the divine service.'⁴⁶

This has some implications for our understanding of God: all doctrine of God must start with God being a God of presence, not a God of absence, as at least some common readings of Karl Barth and Jürgen Moltmann suggest, and those many people in church and theology who follow them.

Contrary to this widely spread attitude, the Christian God is a God of presence, of saving presence, to be more precise, and it is the task of theology to describe the sort of God that God needs to be in order to be the God who is present and whose presence is saving. The unfolding of this, as Bonhoeffer has shown, leads to the same insights into the divine nature which the early Church expressed with the (at least at first sight) paradoxical statements that God is one being in three persons and that Jesus Christ has two natures in one person.

It is the task of theology today to interpret and reformulate these insights within our contemporary discourse so that we may express the saving presence of Christ adequately and thus bear witness to the triune God in the world.

Endnotes

1. This sentiment is also reflected in Christos Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age*, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline, Mass., 2006, p. 16.
2. For example in Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West*, pp. 41–42, and Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, James Clarke, London, 1973, p. 26.
3. STh 1a q13 a5–6.
4. Heinrich Denzinger, *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, trans. Roy J Deferrari, Loreto Publications, Fitzwilliam, NH, 2002, p. 432.

5. For a full discussion of the two approaches in relation to Vladimir Lossky and John Zizioulas see Aristotle Papanikolaou, *Being with God: Trinity, Apophaticism, and Divine-Human Communion*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Ind., 2006.
6. Vladimir Lossky, 'Apophasis and Trinitarian Theology', *In the Image and Likeness of God*, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY, 1985, p. 13.
7. Lossky, 'Apophasis and Trinitarian Theology', pp. 28–29.
8. Christos Yannaras, *On the Absence and Unknowability of God: Heidegger and the Areopagite*, T & T Clark, London, 2005, p. 78.
9. Yannaras, *On the Absence and Unknowability of God*, p. 78.
10. Yannaras, *On the Absence and Unknowability of God*, p. 83.
11. Yannaras, *On the Absence and Unknowability of God*, p. 87. Yannaras' insistence on the distinction between divine essence and energies does not need to be discussed here.
12. Yannaras, *On the Absence and Unknowability of God*, p. 96.
13. Christos Yannaras, *Elements of Faith: An Introduction to Orthodox Theology*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1991, pp. 16–17.
14. Alexander S Jensen, *Theological Hermeneutics*, SCM Core Text, SCM Press London, 2007, pp. 217–21.
15. Friedrich Schleiermacher, *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*, ed. Richard Crouter, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 1996, p. 29.
16. Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, trans. James S Stewart and HR Mackintosh, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1999, §3.2 (pp. 6–7).
17. Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, §29.3 (p. 125).
18. Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, §63, Thesis (p. 262).
19. Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, §34, Thesis (pp. 137–38).
20. Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, §30, Thesis (p. 125).
21. Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, §109–10 (pp. 496–510). In these sections Schleiermacher speaks repeatedly of union of the believer with Christ, but once also of 'union with the Supreme Being' (§110.3, p. 510).
22. Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, §28.2 (p. 120).
23. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', in Larry L Rasmussen (ed.), *Berlin, 1932–1933*, Dietrich Bonhoeffer Works, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN, 2009, pp. 310–11.
24. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', pp. 310–11.
25. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', pp. 310–11.

26. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 312.
27. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Christology*, Collins, London, 1966, p. 45. The clause 'in doing so, they destroy the Church' is missing in the critical edition (p. 312). Even if this clause is not authentic, it reflects Bonhoeffer's sentiment accurately.
28. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 304.
29. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 314.
30. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 314.
31. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 314.
32. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 314.
33. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 328.
34. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 310.
35. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 302.
36. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 331.
37. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 331.
38. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 332.
39. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 353.
40. Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1936.
41. Bonhoeffer, 'Lectures on Christology', p. 315.
42. The relation of Bonhoeffer's understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit as expressed in the 'Lectures on Christology' and that in *Sanctorum Communio* would be important to explore. However, this is beyond the scope of this paper. (Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Sanctorum Communio: A Theological Study of the Sociology of the Church*, trans. Clifford J Green, Dietrich Bonhoeffer Works, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1998, pp. 157–207.)
43. Horst Georg Pöhlmann, *Heiliger Geist: Gottesgeist, Zeitgeist Oder Weltgeist?* Reihe Apologetischer Themen, Friedrich Bahn Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1998, p. 15.
44. Church of England, Holy Communion Order 1, Eucharistic Prayer B, *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England*, Church House Publishing, London, 2000, pp. 189–90.
45. Basil of Caesarea, *On the Holy Spirit*, 47 (Basil of Caesarea, *On the Holy Spirit*, trans. David Anderson, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY, 1980, pp. 74–75.)

46. Oswald Bayer, *Theology the Lutheran Way*, trans. Jeffrey G Silcock and Mark C Mattes, Lutheran Quarterly Books, William B Eerdmans Pub. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 2007, p. 93.

Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)